

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 17 and 20 have been amended for clarity.

The Examiner has rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 101, in that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants have amended claim 17 such that it now recites "A non-transitory computer-readable medium having stored thereon...." As such, Applicants believe that claim 17 is now statutory.

The Examiner has rejected claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 101, in that applicant is claiming both a machine as recited in claim 20 and a process as claimed in claim 1.

Applicants have amended claim 20 such that there is no reference to claim 1. Rather, the encoded signal to be decoded by the decoder of claim 20 is defined by how the encoded signal is formed.

Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has allowed claims 1-16 and 19.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-17 and 19-21, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/  
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611